



1984

Chinese parents' support for the bilingual educational program

Edmond Lee
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lee, Edmond. (1984). *Chinese parents' support for the bilingual educational program*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3182

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

CHINESE PARENTS' SUPPORT FOR THE BILINGUAL
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Edmond Lee

1984

This dissertation, written and submitted by

EDMOND LEE

is approved for recommendation to the Committee
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific

Dean of the School or Department Chairman:

J. B. Hawley

Dissertation Committee:

T. C. Coleman

Chairman

Elizabeth Yip Blanchard

Fred Ankel

Augustine Davis

Bobby R. Hopkins

Dated

August 29, 1984

CHINESE PARENTS' SUPPORT FOR THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Abstract of Dissertation

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to examine support for the bilingual education program. Specifically, this study focused on parents whose children are in bilingual education classes in the elementary grades and sought to explore the relationship between support and several independent variables. They were: (a) socioeconomic status of the parents, (b) parental involvement with the program, and (c) parent influence in the program.

Procedure: Questionnaires were sent to 256 Chinese parents who had children in an elementary bilingual education program in Oakland. A total of 191 or 76.4 percent returned the survey. The respondents were asked to respond to questions. The questionnaire was divided into three sections consisting of questions designed to provide information about the following areas: (1) socioeconomic status; (2) parents' involvement; and (3) parent influence in the program. The data were computer processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science.

Findings: Three null hypotheses were tested. Hypothesis one stated that there is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent socioeconomic status. The study found no significant statistical difference between parent support and socioeconomic status. However, a further analysis of income indicated a negative relationship to parental support. Hypothesis two stated that there is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual education program and parent involvement. The findings reveal that parent involvement is correlated with parent support in a positive manner. Hypothesis two is rejected. Hypothesis three stated that there is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual education program and parent influence in the program. The findings reveal that parent influence is not correlated with parent support. Hypothesis is retained.

Recommendations: Additional research is recommended in four areas:

- 1) A study to clear up conceptually the two bilingual program terms, maintenance and transition.
- 2) A study of recent immigrant parents from different ethnic groups to see why or if they want bilingual education.
- 3) A study to compare immigrant families in order to ascertain if there is a trend for them to become less supportive of bilingual education as they become more economically successful.
- 4) An interview methodology to be done with a larger and more economically diverse population, which might yield greater understanding of these issues.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to:

May Lee, Mother

Hoy Lee, Father

Eddie Lee, Brother

Cindy Lee, Sister-in-law

and

Cindy Wong, Wife.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere appreciation to Dr. T. C. Coleman, program advisor and dissertation committee chairperson. To Dr. Fred Muskal, whose time and suggestions made it possible to undertake and complete this study. Thanks to Dr. Bobby Hopkins in the area of statistical analysis. Appreciation is extended to Dr. Elizabeth Blanchard and Dr. Augustus Garcia.

Special thanks goes to Mr. Marvin Gentz, who provided invaluable commentary on the study. Commendation goes to Mr. John Howe and Mrs. Janney Wong, Chinese translators of the parent questionnaire. Grateful recognition to the San Francisco Unified School District's Special Funding Department and the Oakland Unified School District's Department of Research and Evaluation. I am indebted to the school principals, teachers, students, parents, and friends who made this all possible.

Special words of thanks to the following who gave me that extra push: Eddie Lee, Cindy Lee, Clifford Taw, Peter Tinkelenberg, Dr. William F. Riley and Family, Cornell Lee, Susan Lee, Jose Cerda, Paul Nava, Mike Garcia and Helen Lee.

Most of all I am indebted to Cindy Wong for sacrificing and postponing her dreams and aspirations so that I might achieve mine.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	3
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	3
The Hypotheses	4
Method of Analysis	4
Limitations and Assumptions	5
Definitions	5
Significance of the Study	7
Procedures	7
Organization of the Study	8
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
The Evolution of a Definition for Bilingual Education	10
Historical Perspective on Bilingual Education	10
The Politics of Bilingual Education	13
Sentiments in America	17
Bilingual Legislation	20
The Opponents and Supporters of Bilingual Education Today	25
The Issue of Bilingual Program Types	28

Chapter	Page
California Legislation on Bilingual Programs	30
Relations Between Parents and Teachers .	40
Summary	48
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	51
The Population and Sample	51
School Sample	52
Schooling	54
Family Income Profile	58
Socioeconomic Status	58
The Development of the Instrument	58
Questionnaire Content	60
The Rating Scale Used	61
Methods of Data Collection	62
Treatment of the Data	63
Summary	63
4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	65
Introduction	65
Testing of the Hypotheses	70
Hypothesis One	70
Hypothesis Two	72
Hypothesis Three	75
Summary	75

Chapter	Page
5. CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	76
Conclusions	76
Discussion and Recommendations for Further Research	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY	89
APPENDIX	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sample Distribution: Frequency of Parent Responses (in Percentages) Years Lived in the United States	53
2. Sample of Distribution: Frequency of Parent Responses by Country of Origin (in Percentages)	54
3. Sample Distribution: Parental Schooling, Occupation and Income Levels (in Percentages) Parental Attainment . . .	55
4. Level of Parents' Socioeconomic Status . . .	66
5. Level of Parent Support for Bilingual Education	67
6. Level of Parent Influence Upon the Bilingual Education Program	68
7. Level of Parental Involvement (Participation, Knowledge) with the Bilingual Education Program	69
8. Pearson Correlation Matrix for Variables Support (PS), Education (EDUC), Occupation (OCCU), Income and Socioeconomic Status (SES)	71
9. Pearson Correlation Matrix for Variables Parental Involvement, Parent Influence and Parent Support	73
10. Analysis of Variance of Parents' Involvement/Parent Support	74

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The federal government's war on poverty and the failure of schools to provide equal educational opportunities to non-English speaking students at the local school site have thrust parents into a central role in education.¹ The school professional is expected to take into account the expectations of the community and parents if the education programs are to be effective. Leo R. Lopez, then Chief of California's Bureau of Community Services, stated, "School districts which have made a special effort to develop and promote the use of Advisory Committees have, by far, implemented the best programs in our state."²

Bilingual education programs are no exception. Since these programs are funded by state and federal monies, they require parental involvement in the form of advisory committees. However, there is a lack of knowledge concerning the proper relationship between a mode of parental involvement and successful bilingual education programs. Many areas of conflict exist concerning bilingual

¹ Lau v. Nichols, 414, U.S., 563 (1974).

² Elinor K. Wolf, "The Case for Parental Involvement," Parents Magazine, XLIV (February, 1969), 41.

education programs. The major conflict appears to be philosophical. Bilingual program directors sometimes disagree on the direction a program should take and thus conflict can occur.

One group of educators advocates a maintenance approach, while the other believes that a transitional approach is best. A concise definition of a transitional bilingual education program would be one which emphasizes the mastery of English as rapidly as possible, while a maintenance bilingual education approach would develop all skills in both languages. The implications for educational practice differ significantly depending on which approach is adopted by the professional educator.

This conflict also exists among parents who are concerned with what type of program would best suit the needs of their children. Confrontation between professional educators and parents of children in bilingual education programs often occurs. Parents have in-depth and long-term knowledge of their children, their strengths and weaknesses, their needs and their problems. The exchange of such information with trained professionals may help school administrators in planning a better, more relevant, school program.³

³ U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Parental Involvement in Title I ESEA. (DHEW Publication No. (OE) 72-109), (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 1.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

Little has been written concerning the role of the parent in a bilingual education program. The roles of the teacher, resource teacher, and program coordinator have been acknowledged as essential to the bilingual program.⁴

Parental involvement can take many forms including the serving as teacher aides, school volunteers, and members of school advisory committees. Studies have concluded that there is a need for parental involvement and support of bilingual education programs if these programs are to be successful.⁵ Specifically, there is a lack of knowledge pertaining to the relationship between Chinese parental involvement and personal variables as they relate to bilingual education program support.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine parents' support for the bilingual education program. This study

⁴ Paul Nava, "Bilingual/Bicultural Program Coordinator Role and Role Effectiveness," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1979), p. 33.

⁵ Lorraine P. Gutierrez, "Attitudes Toward Bilingual Education: A Study of Parents with Children in Selected Bilingual Programs," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1972), p. 18.

focused on parents whose children are in bilingual education classes in the elementary grades and sought to explore the relationship between support and several independent variables. The variables included: (a) socioeconomic status of the parents, (b) parental involvement with the program, and (c) parent influence in the program.

The Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. There is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent socioeconomic status.

Hypothesis 2. There is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent involvement (participation and knowledge).

Hypothesis 3. There is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent influence in the program.

Method of Analysis

Data gathered were analyzed using the Pearson r to measure correlation and to uncover potential relationships. In addition, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to the data in order to gain further clarification of the relationships.⁶

⁶ L. R. Gay, Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976), p. 232.

Limitations and Assumptions

Practical considerations caused the following limits to be placed on the study: (1) The schools sampled were restricted geographically to Oakland, California. (2) The sample was restricted to Chinese parents who have children in the public schools.

Certain assumptions are implicit in any study. It is assumed that the respondents answered candidly and honestly with regard to their attitudes and perceptions toward the bilingual program.

Definitions

For the purposes of this study the following definitions are utilized:

1. Biliterate/Bilingualism (Maintenance): In this kind of program, students are to develop all skills in both languages in all domains. Typically, both languages are used as media of instruction for all subjects.⁷
2. Bilingual/Bicultural Education: An education program which uses at least two languages and related cultural

⁷ Joshua A. Fishman, Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective (Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1976), p. 24.

references for imparting curricular content to students.⁸

3. Bilingual Education: The use of two languages, one of which is English, as a medium of instruction for the same pupil population in a program which encompasses and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongue.⁹
4. Dominant Language: The language in which a bilingual person finds greater ease and comfort in his communication with others.¹⁰
5. Parent Influence: The amount of influence perceived by the parents on the bilingual education program.
6. Transitional Bilingualism: In such a program the student's dominant language is used in the early grades to the extent necessary to allow pupils to "adjust to school" and/or to "master subject matter" until their skill in English is developed to the point that it alone can be used as the medium of

⁸ Atilaho Valencia, Implementing Bilingual/Bicultural Education (Berkeley: Bay Area Bilingual Education League, 1976), p. 43.

⁹ Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, ESEA). Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 1.

¹⁰ Valencia, op. cit., p.44.

instruction. Such programs do not strive toward goals of fluency and literacy in both languages.¹¹

7. Chinese: Persons who can trace their ancestry back to China.

Significance of the Study

This work may provide a basis for parents and administrators to work together in the development of desirable bilingual education programs. The bilingual education program administrator may be able to gather support to maintain, modify or expand the programs in existence.

Procedures

The sample population was selected from among Chinese parents who had children in bilingual education programs. The parents selected had children attending the Oakland public schools. The sample was 191 Chinese parents who had children attending bilingual education programs and was selected from a list of Chinese students who were attending bilingual education programs. Selection of the Oakland School District to be surveyed was based on the following criteria:

¹¹ Fishman, op. cit., p. 35.

- a. the school district had been involved in Chinese bilingual education for a minimum of four years and had implemented a K-3 bilingual education program.
- b. the school district received State or Federal funding for the implementation of Chinese bilingual education.
- c. the school district had a Chinese bilingual education program office.
- d. the school district personnel had indicated a willingness to participate in the study.

These criteria were used in order to show that the participating school district selected had a legitimate and on-going Chinese bilingual program.

A questionnaire was developed through a review of the literature and a subsequent revision of other bilingual education questionnaires pertinent to this study. A panel of experts in the field of education reviewed the questionnaire for relevance and applicability. The questionnaire was field tested with Chinese parents in San Francisco who had children in a bilingual education program to determine the validity of the instrument.

Organization of the Study

This chapter has discussed the need for parental support of bilingual education programs, the problem,

significance of the study and procedures. Chapter 2 reviews the related literature, Chapter 3 expands upon the methodology, Chapter 4 describes the analysis of the data, and Chapter 5 outlines the conclusions and recommendations.

.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The Evolution of a Definition for Bilingual Education

This chapter reviews the literature relating to parental support of bilingual education programs. The chapter is divided into six parts. The first part presents an historical overview of bilingual education, including the Asian experience in America. The second part focuses on the politics of education in American history. The laws of bilingual education are reviewed in the third part and the fourth part examines bilingual education program types and state legislation in California bilingual education programs. Finally, parts five and six examine how teachers and parents perceive their role in the educational process.

Historical Perspective on Bilingual Education

The current controversy surrounding the definition of bilingual education reflects an historically developed ideology and philosophy. From the experience of the researcher, opponents of bilingual education generally argue that "for the good of the children we must get them into English as soon as possible." The opponents' arguments generally use such key words as: inefficient, un-American,

assimilation, mainstream, melting pot, ethnocentrism, equal educational opportunity, politics, and concept. They usually favor a transitional type bilingual program for non- or limited-English-language children. Supporters and proponents view bilingual education as a means to rectify the discouraging academic performance of children with English-language difficulties. The proponents of bilingual education generally make arguments that use phrases such as: cultural pluralism, national welfare, multi-linguistic, positive self concept, equal education opportunity, survival, basic education. They allow the child to build upon his/her own culture and language. The proponents of bilingual education generally favor a maintenance type program.

Bilingual education in the public schools of the United States is not a recent educational innovation. Bilingualism has been instrumental not only in the founding of the United States, but also in our linguistic heritage. For example, during the War of Independence, the Continental Congress had many of its proclamations translated and printed in German.¹

Prior to 1850, English-speaking immigrants dominated the social and political institutions of the United States. Even after the arrival of large groups of non-English

¹ Heinz Kloss, The American Bilingual Tradition (Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1977), p. 26.

speaking citizens, those who spoke English had a clear advantage in understanding the intricacies of government and held the majority of elected positions. Following the large German speaking people in midwestern America, the astute politician who had national aspirations quickly grasped the need to influence this group of voters. Abraham Lincoln even tried to learn German grammar and, for a time, owned a German language newspaper.²

With the German immigrants, foreign language programs spread from Pennsylvania, in 1839, to Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, and Minnesota, until there were some 9 million Germans served by 1910. The German bloc had enough power to compel state legislatures to allow and maintain the teaching of basic subjects in the German language. The Cincinnati Public Schools in the 1850's recognized instruction in German or English, thus setting a precedent for a maintenance-type foreign language program.³ Other school districts that offered foreign language instruction programs had other motives.

The St. Louis schools offered German language instruction as a means of luring German children into the public

² LaVern Rippley, The German-Americans (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1976), p. 73.

³ Ibid., p. 120.

schools to hasten their assimilation into the host culture.

According to Rippley,

With this objective, the St. Louis board provided German-language instruction in reading, writing, and speaking. However, as soon as a pupil had progressed as far as the second reader and primary geography, he was to attend classes in English.⁴

The existence of a German foreign language program by the German speaking community at that time effectively established one of the first bilingual education maintenance type programs in the United States.

The Politics of Bilingual Education

Governmental interest in education dates back to the colony of Massachusetts with the passage of the "old deluder Satan" law in 1642.⁵ Education was viewed in early American history as a function of local authority and control. For the most part the Federal government's main influence on schools was by land grants, for it was viewed that as long as the local educational institution largely raised its own school revenues it was given substantial autonomy.⁶ This situation remained stable until the 1950's.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Stephen Bailey and E. K. Moshen, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968), p. 1.

⁶ Ibid., p. 2.

Historically, the role of the Federal government in education has been minimal, and any suggested increase in that role has been generally feared and fought. This has been substantiated by a review survey conducted by the Phi Delta Kappan:

The American public continues to believe that the local school board should have the greatest influence in deciding what is taught in the public schools. Even the state government wins few supporters as the agency that should decide what is taught locally.

During the years of 1954-67, the Federal government's concern and interest in improving quality in public education at all levels resulted in increased involvement in four areas: (1) desegregation, (2) education related to defense and vocations, (3) aid to research, and (4) education of the economically and culturally disadvantaged and handicapped.⁸

A variety of social and political issues resulted in the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. According to Baily, ESEA was not a Federal handout to ease state and local educational budgets. Instead, it mandated a series of programs and priorities which involved a massive shift in the locus of policy-making power in American education. This resulted in the Economic

⁷ George H. Gallup, "The 12th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, LXII (September, 1980), p. 36.

⁸ Bailey, op. cit., p. 2.

Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA), and the consequent Community Action Program (CAP), which is the most original, far-reaching and controversial of endeavors in the "War on Poverty."

In the Administration of the EOA, high priority was given to community action programs. It was assumed that the poor themselves could successfully plan programs to meet their own needs. This suggests that parents should be involved in the development and approval of bilingual education programs.⁹

It was inevitable that public schools would become involved with the Community Action Program. Title I of ESEA mandated cooperation between the local school agencies and the CAPs and this resulted in the Office of Education's requirements for parental involvement. Also, parent councils were mandated by Public Law 91-230 and the publication of subsequent regulations. Regulations of this law clearly state that if payments are to be made to local agencies under Title I, parents must be involved in the planning, development, operation, and evaluation of Title I projects.¹⁰ It was hoped that as parental involvement increased, so too would student ambition and achievement.

⁹ Bailey, op. cit., p. 33.

¹⁰ (DHEW Publication No. (OE) 72-109), op. cit., p. 3.

This, in turn, could possibly dissipate the atmosphere of rebelliousness and powerlessness then prevalent in our urban ghettos. This is an example of the transfer of limited power to the parent and the consumer.¹¹

Therefore, it is crucial that parents be involved in model programs if they are to succeed. Programs such as Rev. Jesse Jackson's PUSH for Excellence Program urged parents to visit schools, read to their children, and help the schools fight violence, drug addiction, and truancy.

One on-site program that appears promising is a school-site budget committee. This committee would be comprised of school administrators, teachers, and parents. Their function would be to allocate funds in a way that suited an individual school. These concepts, according to Cronin, could forge a new and stronger bond in the necessary alliance between parents and educators toward the goal of high-quality education.¹²

The war on poverty movement brought recognition that parents were crucial in model programs. This provided a new stipulation to the definition of education for

¹¹ Martin Rein and S. M. Miller, Citizen Participation and Poverty: Educating the Disadvantaged, School Year 1968-69, Vol. I, Part 2 (New York: A.M.S. Press, 1970), p. 174.

¹² Joseph M. Cronin, "Parents and Educators: Natural Allies," Phi Delta Kappan, LIX (December 1977), 243.

minorities that there must be parental participation to gain federal funding. Bilingual education followed a similar historical pattern.

Sentiments in America

In the years following the Civil War organized labor made a concerted effort to organize the white workers. Hence, labor viewed big business and the strike-breaking Chinese as natural enemies of the labor movement. Dennis Kearny, head of the California Working Man's Party, campaigned on the slogan, "The Chinese Must Go," which was taken by white laborers as a panacea for all their economic problems.¹³ Samuel Gompers and his American Federation of Labor Union also joined to oust the Chinese in 1900.¹⁴

The combination of these efforts was motivated by an anti-Chinese union as a means to restrict political power to English-speaking white Americans. With the aid of other racially inclined parties, Congress introduced and passed a number of laws to protect the United States from undesirable foreigners.¹⁵ Laws were enacted to prevent

¹³ Elmer C. Sandmeyer, The Anti-Chinese Movement in California (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1973), p. 65.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 106.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 57.

immigrants from becoming citizens and thereby excluded this group from the democratic political process.

Any person seeking public office had to publicly condemn the Chinese. Henry K. Norton wrote in his book, The Story of California:

Every man in public life was under so binding a necessity to accept the popular belief in regard to the Chinese and to truckle to it at every turn, for one to seek the real truth of the matter was to end forthwith his political career.¹⁶

With this political climate, anti-Chinese bills and acts were quickly passed by the U.S. Congress. The anti-Chinese forces whetted their racial hatred with the passage of the Scott Act in 1888, which prohibited the coming or returning of Chinese laborers to the United States. This denied re-entry for 20,000 Chinese laborers who had gone back to China and resulted in the break up of many Chinese families and businesses.¹⁷ The anti-Chinese forces pushed for harsher measures in the form of the Geary Act of 1892:

It practically stripped the Chinese of any protection in courts, singled out the Chinese to be denied the rights upon which western justice is based, and subjected to suspicion all Chinese in the United States.

¹⁶ Betty Lee Sung, The Story of the Chinese in America (New York: Collier Books, 1971), p. 49.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 54.

The Geary Act extended all bills in force against the Chinese for another ten years. No bail was to be permitted the Chinese in habeas corpus cases. All Chinese were required to obtain a certificate of eligibility to remain in the United States. And if a Chinese was arrested without a certificate, the burden of proof fell upon him.¹⁸

These were the unconstitutional laws enacted to ostracize the Chinese. The Chinese were the scapegoats for the economic ills of the nation and action by the American people gave accurate meaning to the popular phrase "Not a Chinaman's chance."¹⁹

. . . 1885, reports of a massacre of twenty-eight Chinese strike-breakers in Rock Springs, Wyoming, fanned the flames of working-class agitation in neighboring states. Chinese were driven bodily out of Tacoma, Washington, and most were driven out of Seattle. Violence spread to San Francisco, which was already turbulent with the conflict between labor unions and employers over the hiring of Chinese. . . . In 1893, another panic and high unemployment in California brought a crisis to rural California and a condition "approximating civil war" to the Sacramento Valley. Rioting spread through the area and the Chinese were driven from the fields and forced to find employment in Chinatowns. In the San Joaquin Valley, armed mobs in Tulare, Visalia, and Fresno intimidated Chinese with blows and pistol shots and drove them to the railroad station, where they were loaded onto departing trains. The rioting then spread to Ukiah and Vacaville. In September 1893, raiders swept into Redlands Chinatown, broke into houses, set fire to buildings, and looted Chinese stores. This terrorism and violence resulted, between 1890 and 1900, in the first real drop in the Chinese male population in California. Those who could afford it returned to China, many others departed for the East Coast.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 55.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 56.

Still others sought refuge in the crowded Chinese settlements of the larger cities from which it had become unsafe to venture without fear of being beaten as late as the 1920s.²⁰

As a result, the people were forced into ghetto areas named Chinatowns. The above sentiments toward the Chinese in America had profound negative effects for many years.

Bilingual Legislation

Research done by Kloss shows that naturalization laws assume considerable importance to minority groups who do not speak English and are denied the right to become American citizens, for they are also prevented from becoming a viable political entity. Immigrants who were not English speakers could be, and were, denied citizenship because of race.²¹

As late as 1922, the Supreme Court ruled that a Japan-born Japanese "being clearly not a caucasian" could not be naturalized (Takao Ozawa vs. United States, 260 U.S. 178) and that already naturalized foreign-born Japanese are not legal citizens (Yamashi vs. Hinkle, 260 U.S. 19).²²

American-born children of Asians needed a decision from the Supreme Court (1898) to rule that they were citizens according to jus soli (United States vs. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649). As for the Mexicans, a federal district court decided in 1897 that they

²⁰ Victor G. and Brett de Bary Nee, Longtime Californ' (Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 54.

²¹ Kloss, op. cit., p. 21.

²² Kloss, op. cit., p. 21.

could become citizens regardless of their affinity (in re Rodriguez, 81 Fed. 337-1 Dec. Dig. 61) because of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848).²³

It was not until the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 (66 Sta. 239, SCC. 31; U.S. Code 1422) that all "legal" and "racial" limitations were abolished. With this as a background it could be assumed that bilingual education did not receive popular support in the United States. However, the bilingual movement in the United States was stimulated by two popular beliefs: the United States educational system was falling behind other countries, especially the Soviet Union, and a knowledge of foreign languages was essential for a world power.²⁴

In response, the United States Office of Education, the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, and the Languages-of-the-World Archives in Bloomington, Indiana, collaborated to conduct surveys of all living languages in the world. In order to determine if experts were required for the major languages which were not commonly taught to American students, the United States Office of Education promoted the FLES (Foreign Languages in Elementary Schools) movement in the public schools. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provided considerable funds for the

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 34.

promotion of the teaching of foreign languages and other subjects in elementary and high schools.²⁵

✓ It took almost a decade before the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1967 was passed. Prior to this, the 1960 census revealed that five southwestern states with significant Spanish surname populations had the following statistics. "In the five states," writes Kloss, "the Spanish surname youth had completed an average of only 4.7 years in school compared to 8.1 for the nonwhite and to 12.1 for "Anglo students fourteen years of age or over."²⁶ This concern for the apparent lack of educational equality on the part of children with Spanish surnames prompted the National Education Association in 1966 to sponsor conferences in other states, especially in Texas.

As a result, Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas introduced a bill to provide assistance for local educational agencies to establish bilingual programs for Mexican-American and Puerto Rican children. James Scheuer, a congressman from New York, rewrote the bill to include all children who do not speak English and added teacher training, material development, and demonstration projects.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 35.

²⁶ Ibid.

My purpose in doing this, Yarborough declared in the Senate of December 1, 1967 (Congressional Record, p. 34703), "is not to keep any specific language alive. It is not the purpose of the bill to create pockets of different languages throughout the country . . . not to stamp out the mother tongue, and not to try to make their mother tongue the dominant language, but just to try to make those children fully literate in English." He thus left open the question of whether the purpose of the new program was to perpetuate minority tongues or to speed up assimilation by a deft shortcut.²⁷

Kloss further reports that probably the earliest Spanish-English programs in the South were in Miami (1963), and in Texas, "Laredo United Consolidated" (1954). In 1972 Laredo became the first city school system in the United States to conduct all schooling bilingually.²⁸

The definition of bilingual education that Yarborough assumed was one of legally making non-English speakers into literate English speaking people. Bilingual education was now discussed in terms of national need and importance.

Benjamin in The Schools and National Security writes:

Language study can also help produce increasingly competent leaders by providing an understanding of the courses of our belief in democracy and our ideas of international law and order, and by affording a secure knowledge of the political, social, and cultural backgrounds of the peoples

²⁷ Ibid., p. 37.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 38.

with whom our country must deal effectively. This applies alike to our actual and potential allies, and to those with whom we are in conflict.²⁹

What started out as an ethnic group maintaining its language and culture now gained a national political meaning. World events occurred that brought home the realization that we are not isolated from the rest of the world; language knowledge and language usage became important for national security. A national security meaning or national policy meaning to bilingual education emerged.

With the war on poverty programs and the equal educational opportunity movement, there emerged an educational equality opportunity meaning for bilingual education. The Bilingual Educational Act not only allocated funds for bilingual programs, it also "institutionalized" the notion that equality of educational opportunity is not the same as equal education.³⁰ Within this framework there are different ethnic groups interpreting the definition of bilingual education to fit the needs of their community and educational professionals formulating programs to meet the educational needs of their communities.

²⁹ Harold Benjamin (ed.), The Schools and National Security (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951), p. 162.

³⁰ J. M. Gonzalez, "Coming of Age in Bilingual/Bicultural Education a Historical Perspective," Inequality in Education, No. 19 (February 1975), 10.

The Opponents and Supporters of
Bilingual Education Today

Opponents of bilingual education charge that it is expensive, inefficient and above all un-American. Quoted by Time Magazine, Diane Ravitch of Columbia University's Teachers College: "There are cases of third-generation Puerto Ricans in bilingual classes. That just doesn't make sense."³¹ Other educators see bilingual education programs as a push for jobs and power rather than an educational vehicle to help children. Thernstrom's views express this sentiment:

The programs (bilingual education) provide both employment and political opportunities, as schools are forced to hire Hispanics without regular teaching credentials, and as students are molded into an ethnically conscious constituency. Moreover, both Hispanic leaders and their supporters in White Civil Rights circles are committed to ethnic pluralism. They do not believe in assimilation of a common culture, or in schools as transmitters of that culture. The whole notion of the melting pot, in their view, must be condemned.³²

Thereby, according to Thernstrom, bilingual programs do a great injustice to the participants by

. . . failing to provide these children with a solid grounding in English and failing to integrate them with the culture of their peers, it condemns them to the economically marginal existence that

³¹ Anon., "Battle over Bilingualism," Time, (September 8, 1980), p. 64.

³² Abigail M. Thernstrom, "Bilingual Mis-education," New Republic (April 18, 1981), p. 16.

too many of their parents have endured. It closes the door, in other words, to educational and economic opportunity.³³

Supporters of bilingual education see it as a vast improvement over past sink-or-swim school techniques that Americanized earlier immigrants. Advocates of bilingual education dismiss the notion that the program aggravates ethnic tensions. Herbert Teitelbaum, legal director of the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund wrote:

Ethnic tensions are created not by Bilingual Education but, on the contrary, by notions of language and cultural superiority that have formed a basis for much of the resistance to Bilingual Education.³⁴

As to the charge that bilingual education hinders educational and economic opportunities, Valverde and Brown wrote:

. . . the concept of Equal Education Opportunity was aimed not only at stopping unequal treatment within schools, but also at the establishment of better educational programs for the expressed purpose of providing a means of bringing future generations of traditionally excluded groups into society as full participating members. In short, Equal Educational Opportunity was to improve the social and economic status of poverty groups. The logic behind the concept of Equal Educational Opportunity aimed at the poor and minority groups was that it would (a) improve their social status

³³ Thernstrom, op. cit., p. 17.

³⁴ Anon., The New York Times (May 26, 1975), p. 35, vol. 4.

(b) upgrade their occupational economic status, and (c) improve their average educational attainment.³⁵

The best argument for bilingual education, its supporters point out, is the discouraging academic performance of children with English-language difficulties. The educational difficulties of Hispanic children have been well researched and documented. As an example, a report issued in May 20, 1977, by the National Assessment of Educational Progress showed that:

. . . Hispanic children tested consistently below the national average in reading, science, mathematics, social studies and career development and repeated more grades than other children.³⁶

The assumptions set forth are that if people are allowed to retain some of their culture and heritage, they will learn how to participate in American society from a position of strength; becoming bicultural is a way to ease them into the mainstream. The other alternative has been to strip them of all their culture and language, often leaving them in an inferior position.

³⁵ Leonard A. Valverde and Frank Brown, "Equal Educational Opportunity and Bilingual/Bicultural Education: A Socioeconomic Perspective," Education and Urban Society, Vol. X, No. 3 (May 1978), 282.

³⁶ National Assessment of Educational Progress, "Hispanic Student Achievement in Five Learning Areas: 1971-75," May, 1977, p. 44. National Assessment of Educational Progress is funded by and under contract with the National Center for Educational Statistics.

Another possible support for bilingual education would be in the area of National Security. The United States would have a trained body of talented people able to communicate in other languages and cultures. Historically, the United States Department of State has tried to develop experts in the field of bilingualism. In the scope of National Security and especially within the intelligence community, the culture of a people is as important as the language in order to understand various events. These issues become summarized in the two main program types of bilingual education.

The Issue of Bilingual Program Types

Bilingual education programs generally fall into one of two categories. In the transitional approach, students use their native language until their English is strong enough for them to shift into regular classes. The bilingual component of the child's education is considered temporary, to be used as a support until the child can make the transition to English. Transitional programs usually end by the time the child has finished the third grade.

Maintenance programs have a much broader and ambitious purpose. In maintaining programs, students learn bilingually even after they have mastered English. The program strives to educate the students as bilingual/bicultural citizens. In a maintenance program, the two languages and

cultures are given equal importance and both languages are used equally as mediums of instruction. The students remain in the program throughout elementary school, and ideally throughout high school as well. Dubbed "Affirmative Ethnicity" by one critic, maintenance programs are the most controversial of instructional programs for overcoming language barriers. Some opponents view maintenance programs as an affront to the melting pot theory of American society. Others fear that its emphasis on cultural pride can foster a separatist mentality. Still others simply believe it prevents a student from becoming truly proficient in either language.³⁷

The maintenance approach was favored by the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education.

A maintenance model, by continuing native language and cultural instruction after English competence is established, formally supports and validates the child's own cultural traditions and values. . . . This formal recognition of the child's self esteem and confidence is necessary to cope with a demanding and often strange educational system.³⁸

³⁷ Arlie Schardt, Lucy Howard, and Patricia King, "A Battle in Any Language," Newsweek (December 15, 1980), p. 94.

³⁸ "Second Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education," (November 1976,) p. 40. The National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education was created by the 1974 Amendments to the Bilingual Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Pulte writes:

. . . critics who fear that bilingual education programs teach only the knowledge associated with the minority culture may feel there are two kinds of knowledge: ours and theirs. This leads to the erroneous view that knowledge of the basic educational skills is specific to the so called mainstream.³⁹

The reason that bilingual education generates so much debate is that its academic effectiveness is hard to measure. Critics and proponents alike have few hard data on which to rely. Both seem to agree that, in the hands of a good teacher, bilingual programs reduce the high dropout rate among non-English speaking students. They also agree that there is an extreme shortage of good bilingual teachers.⁴⁰

California Legislation on Bilingual Programs

Legislation at the State and Federal level for bilingual education is very specific. In the State of California (AB507) bilingual education funds are allocated to conduct classes with the following stipulations:

Elementary: K-6

The District will provide a bilingual program by a bilingual teacher whenever there are ten or more LEP (Limited English Proficient) students

³⁹ William Pulte, "Are Bilingual Bicultural Programs Socially Diverse?" The Educational Digest (May 1977), p. 57.

⁴⁰ "Battle Over Bilingualism," Time (September 8, 1980), p. 65.

with the same primary language in the same grade level, or in a multi-graded setting. Efforts will be made to combine classes including up to two grade levels if this would result in 10 or more LEP students with the same primary language and thus qualify for a bilingual setting.

The District will provide a Bilingual Individual Learning Program (BILP) for all K-6 identified Limited English Proficient (LEP) students not in a bilingual classroom.

Students on BILP will have access to services in primary language comparable to those available for students in a regular program in school. This supplemental instruction will be provided by the bilingual staff members at the school site. For languages in which the District is unable to hire fluent staff to provide primary language instruction, additional ESL and tutoring will be provided.

The District will provide transportation for those students who are not in an attendance zone where a bilingual program is offered.⁴¹

The State is also very specific in regard to parents who have children in the bilingual education programs. The following stipulations are the school districts' responsibilities to the parents.

The school district will notify the parents of all identified LEP (Limited English Proficient) students and FEP (Fluent English Proficient) underachiever students of all school activities or notices which are called to the attention of other parents. (Such notice, in order to be adequate, will be provided in English and in the necessary language(s) exactly paralleling the content in English.)

⁴¹ Oakland Unified School District Office of Bilingual Education Comprehensive Education Plan for Services/Programs, September 1981, pp. 11-27.

The District will inform all parents of LEP and non-LEP students of all aspects of the bilingual program options. These programs constitute an integral part of the total school program.

The District will solicit parent participation in the development of the District's Bilingual Master Plan implementation and in evaluation of the bilingual program.⁴²

The State of California under Assembly Bill 507, Chapter 1339 dated September 30, 1980, has defined three types of bilingual programs and the following is a description of the program types:

- A) Basic Bilingual Education is a system of instruction which builds upon the language skills of the pupil. The purpose of primary language instruction is to sustain achievement in basic subject areas until the transfer to English is made. As the pupil develops English language skills, the amount of instruction offered through English shall increase.

⁴² op. cit., pp. 41-43.

Basic Bilingual Education

<u>English*</u>	<u>Primary Language**</u>
Listening	Listening
Speaking	Speaking
Reading	Reading
Writing	Writing
<hr/>	
Mathematics	These subjects will be taught in the primary language only until the student can make the transfer to English.
Social Studies	
Natural Science	

*Both English as a Second Language and primary language instruction should take place daily.

**Primary Language or Home Language of the pupil.

- B) Bilingual/Bicultural Education is a system of instruction which uses two languages, one of which is English, as a means of instruction. It is a means of instruction which builds upon and expands the existing language skills of each participating pupil, which will enable the pupil to achieve competency in both languages.

Bilingual/Bicultural Education

<u>English*</u>	<u>Primary Language**</u>
Listening	Listening
Speaking	Speaking
Reading	Reading
Writing	Writing
<hr/>	
Mathematics	Mathematics
Social Science	Social Science
Natural Science	Natural Science
Culture and History	Culture and History

*Both English and primary language instruction should take place daily.

**Primary Language or Home Language of the pupil.

C) Experimental Bilingual Programs

- a) Innovative Programs must meet the requirements of either Basic Bilingual Education or Bilingual/Bicultural Education, but can include new management approaches, greater emphasis on team-teaching, or other appropriate improvements which expand the learning opportunities of pupils of limited English proficiency. A description of each such innovative program shall be included

with the consolidated application for program funding and an annual evaluation of such programs shall be included in the multiple-funded program evaluation.

- b) Planned Variation Programs are designed for comparing and improving language development programs for LEP students. The primary focus shall be on appropriate instruction for LEP pupils whose English skills are superior to their primary language skills. These programs must be approved by the State Board of Education and are developed by each school site. Even with such specific guidelines controversy in the area has developed on how these laws should be implemented at the local school agencies. In Oakland where this study was conducted, a description of its bilingual education program is as follows:

Bilingual Education - The Oakland Schools offer bilingual learning opportunities to non-English speaking, limited-English speaking and full-English speaking students enrolled in Kindergarten through grade twelve.

In bilingual classes, the district provides instruction in all academic subjects using two languages (one of which is English) enabling the student to achieve competency in both languages.

Bilingual classes also teach cultural appreciation. The total bilingual/bicultural process enables the pupil to participate effectively in a multilingual/multicultural society.⁴³

The components of a typical bilingual education program in an Oakland elementary school describe as follows:

c) Bilingual/Bicultural Education Program

Language Arts Component

This program is a dual language program where all instruction is given in Chinese and English in order to allow students to develop skills in both languages in all domains. A three hour Chinese-speaking bilingual assistant is provided for each classroom to assist students with all subject areas.

The bilingual program utilizes the same instructional strategies and English language materials in all curriculum areas as those used by the other classes. In addition, use is made of bilingual project-developed materials, teacher-made materials, language arts booklets, task cards, and games. Some of the E.S.L. (English

⁴³ FACTS, Oakland Unified School District, Office Publications/Public Information, (1981), p. 20.

as a Second Language) materials used by the E.S.L. resource teachers are also used in the classroom.

A second program is provided by two E.S.L. resource teachers. One of the teachers provides instruction in the English language for identified students from kindergarten through the third grade. The second teacher provides instruction for the fourth through sixth grade. The limited and non-English speaking students are taken out of their classrooms and grouped according to their skill with English usage. Reading is taught in relation to their primary language (i.e. sentence pattern, vocabulary, tense).

In the lower grades DIM (Developmental Learning Materials) Picture Sets, Ideal Manipulatives, and "Introducing English" are the main materials used by the E.S.L. teachers. In the upper grades, "English Step-by-Step," "Let's learn English," and "Introducing English" are used as primary materials. Both teachers also use a variety of teacher-made materials, and translated materials when necessary. Bilingual community volunteers tutor in the classroom as support personnel.

d) Bilingual/Bicultural Mathematics Component

The program for mathematics utilizes the following elements:

A Basal Program by Addison-Wesley: Investigating School Math.

Supplementary materials include Baratta-Lorton (K-3), Random House (4-6), and Veri-Tech (4-6). Instructional strategies* which include instructional assistant volunteers, team teaching, cross-age/peer tutoring, resource teachers, whole-class, small group, and large group instruction, achievement level grouping, short-term/pull-out instruction, individual/paired instruction, and skill grouping. Multi-media materials, hardware devices, interdisciplinary projects, skill kits, commercial programs, dittos or teacher-made materials and learning/resource centers in the classroom are strategies utilized in English only.

Diagnosis and assessment in English includes publishers' tests, site-prepared tests, student profiles, teacher-made tests, teacher

*All strategies are used in English and Dominant Home Language unless otherwise indicated.

observations, textbook tests, criterion-referenced tests, and norm-references tests. Students who do not speak English or who speak limited-English have instruction in mathematics in their primary language and use materials which have been translated when necessary. Furthermore, bilingual instructional assistants help students in the classroom.

e) Multicultural Education Component

The multicultural education program is composed of the following elements:

1. Use of multi-ethnic materials and ethnic studies units.
2. Class trips and study tours.
3. Recognition of individual student success in scholarship, leadership and creativity.
4. Cultural and multi-ethnic assemblies and programs.
5. Interdisciplinary Projects.
6. Use of foods and costumes to demonstrate cultural differences and/or similarities.
7. Group discussions and class meetings ("Rap" sessions with students, parents or staff.)

All multicultural activities and materials are designed to be integrated into the entire curriculum of the school. The staff developed a school-wide multicultural calendar which stresses a different cultural heritage each month of the school year. Multicultural education is an integral part of social studies and attempts to teach cultural awareness of American social customs for limited-English speaking and non-English speaking students who comprise 80% of the total school population. Examples of assemblies or school-wide events include a European Christmas celebration in December, a Chinese New Year celebration in February, a Black History Assembly in January, a Japanese Awareness Program in April, and Cinco de Mayo in May.

Typical field trips for the primary grades are outdoor experiences at the park or Lake Merritt, visits to the San Francisco Zoo, trips to the Tide Pools, and city tours or studies of the beach. Grades four through six take social studies related field trips to Audubon Canyon, the San Francisco Mint, the Oakland Airport, Wells Fargo Bank, Lawrence Hall of Science, and The Exploratorium. Classroom instructional units emphasize traditional holidays through interdisciplinary projects and multi-ethnic studies.

Relations Between Parents and Teachers

The teachers' recognition of the parents' role in the education of their child appears to take many forms. Some

teachers welcome the parents into the classroom as an aide or a volunteer, while other teachers discourage the parents from visiting the classroom. These latter teachers would like to exclude all parents from meaningful interaction with the school. The reason given is that the teachers should provide the necessary learning environment as the educational professionals.

Lightfoot indicates that teachers have traditionally been viewed as the gatekeepers for their children's future social economic mobility by the parents. Poor and minority parents were sometimes accepted into the teachers' confidence only if they respected and acknowledged the teachers' need for autonomy and control. Another potential ally was the middle-class parent who shared the values of hard work and achievement.⁴⁴

Some teachers tend to be defensive about their professional status, skills and image. Teachers may become threatened when they feel that their autonomy is being questioned by the possibility of observation and participation by non-school people, especially those of higher occupational and educational status. From this defensive posture, teachers often form coalitions only with

⁴⁴ Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, Worlds Apart: Relationships Between Families and Schools (New York: Basic Books Inc., Publishers, 1978), p.32.

those parents who are understanding and generally supportive of their role as the professional educator.⁴⁵

The rights of parents over their children's education is historically grounded. Parents were, and are, the first educators of their children. It is the family's unique position to be able to observe, listen, and to interact with the child in a total environment. Parents are aware that they hold a responsibility for the shaping of the future via the child.⁴⁶ It is in the best interest of the family that the child receive a meaningful educational experience, if for no other reason than that the child not become a financial burden on the family and might even contribute to the family and to the community.

The child's first formalized introduction into an institution is usually the public school. Public school people generally have often taken a jaundiced view of the motives of parents, their concern with the school, and interest in their own children. Roper emphasizes:

In the history of the educators' undeclared war on families, parents have served two main purposes for the school: They produce the clientele and they pay for the system. When parents have demonstrated an understandable

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 37.

⁴⁶ John E. Coons and Stephen D. Sugarman, Education by Choice (Berkeley: University of California, 1978), p. 56.

lack of enthusiasm for this limited and "specialized" participation, educators describe them as apathetic. Now, with the decline in birthrate and increasing disapproval of the system (as registered in failing bond issues), "apathy" has apparently turned to hostility.

In the eyes of educators, the parent was always wrong. Parents were a potential threat to the institution, in that they initially held the power to withhold clients and payment from that system.⁴⁷

To further complicate the picture, the educational institution has been able to convert the school into the primary credentialing agency for occupational status in the United States. As the school is the primary credentialing agent, Thomas indicates:

. . . teachers are occupational gate keepers: through a system of rewards and punishments, they determine to a considerable degree who will and who will not gain access to the social prizes of power, wealth, and prestige. Each student is forced to compete for a limited supply of rewards, and the resources for obtaining those rewards are unequally distributed.⁴⁸

This in turn forces the more knowledgeable parents to apply pressure on offspring and teachers to produce. Here production is equated with "better" grades being the criterion for product.

⁴⁷ Dwight Roper, "Parents as the Natural Enemy of the School System," Phi Delta Kappan, LIX (December 1977), p. 234.

⁴⁸ William B. Thomas, "Parental and Community Involvement: Rx for Better School Discipline," Phi Delta Kappan, LXII (November 1980), 203.

On the school site, parents are encouraged to participate in school community "involvement" activities and discouraged in school community "control" activities. Parents are viewed, in fact, as necessary participants in school fund raising, class trips, as volunteer tutors and in other classroom affairs. Parents are used as a supplement to the regular school program; they are not part of the planned curriculum. In some communities this can be a source of conflict if the relationship and roles of parents and school personnel are not clearly defined.

Until recently, parental involvement in the education of the children was never a prerequisite. However, since 1968, federal law mandates such involvement. Thus, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act made it mandatory that parents become involved in the form of parent councils.⁴⁹ Parental involvement in bilingual programs has been reinforced by the United States Supreme Court in the *Lau v. Nichols* decision. The High Court held in the 1974 case that schools must do more than provide equal facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum for all students, since the students cannot utilize nor benefit from

⁴⁹ (DHEW Publication No. (OE) 72-109), op. cit., p. 3.

this equal treatment because of a language barrier.⁵⁰

The court specifies that:

. . . bilingual education programs shall be developed in consultation with parents of children of limited English speaking ability.⁵¹

Hence, the Bilingual Act of 1974 contains this provision.

f) Parent Participation and Community Involvement
Component

The Parent Participation and Community Involvement component is composed of the following elements:

1. Parent-teacher communication through phone calls and conferences.

2. Luncheons and potlucks.

Monthly School Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings with bilingual staff available to translate for limited and non-English speaking parents. The duties of the committee include the identification of school site needs, establishing program priorities, and planning school site programs, on-going evaluation of the school site program, with parents and teachers cooperating to monitor planned program activities in order to determine the extent of implementation. The criteria of

⁵⁰ Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

⁵¹ Bilingual Education Act (1974).

such process monitoring is determined by the School Advisory Committee (SAC).

The Oakland Unified School District program follows faithfully the requirements of the State's Bilingual Office which acknowledges that a bilingual program is only the framework. To be successful, the program requires the work of dedicated teachers and parents.

It is generally agreed that nowhere is the overall school program, community and parental involvement as crucial as in the bilingual educational program. Ramirez writes that the importance of parental involvement in bilingual programs cannot be emphasized enough. In the St. Lambert (Canada) and Coral Way (Florida) programs, both of which have been highly successful, parent involvement has been a major component of the program.⁵²

Gutierrez's study of Mexican-Americans discovered relatively consistent parental support for bilingual education programs across socioeconomic lines. Among the independent variables studied, however, age emerged as the most significant factor. For example, it shows that persons

⁵² Manuel Ramirez III, et al., Spanish-English Bilingual Education in the United States: Current Issues, Resources and Recommended Funding, Systems and Evaluations in Education Contract No. NIE-C-74-0151, National Institute of Education, 1975, p. 90.

under the age of 35 tended to be more supportive of bilingual education programs. Furthermore, her findings indicated that those in the lower socioeconomic groups were more supportive of bilingual/bicultural programs than those in the upper socioeconomic groups. She also discovered that lower status Mexican-Americans identified more with their culture than the higher status Mexican-Americans.

Gutierrez's explanation was that the transient lower socioeconomic group needed to identify with their culture because of the group's lack of familiarity with a larger metropolitan area.⁵³

An interesting study done in England compared the attitudes, aspirations and knowledgeability of working class mothers toward the educational system. The reported findings were that the working class mothers proved to know far less about the educational system than the middle class parents. In terms of job ambitions and parental expectations the parents had definite conformities by class.

Middle class parents tended to be ambitious beyond the child's intellectual capacity, while working class parents tended to be under-ambitious and to underestimate the child's intellectual ability.⁵⁴

⁵³ Gutierrez, op.cit., p. 144.

⁵⁴ R. Pallister and J. Wilson, "Parents' Attitudes in Education," National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, Vol. 13, No. 2 (November 1970), 56-60.

Past studies have shown that both parents and teachers value formal education as most crucial in influencing a child's intellectual development. It has been concluded that parents and teachers must work together to dispel any hostile stereotypes that teachers and parents have of each other, perceptions that each is uncaring about children and that parents devalue the educational process. The education of the child includes the values of both parents and teachers.⁵⁵

Summary

The bilingual education issue in the United States has been a constant reminder of the racial/economic conflict that exists in this country. With the passing of the Bilingual Education Act of 1967, millions of students, whose primary language is other than English, were given the opportunity to fulfill their educational aspirations. The Bilingual Education Act of 1974 was more explicit in intent and removed the criterion that only students of low income be served. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Lau v. Nichols* has held that school districts receiving Federal funds cannot discriminate against children of limited or non-English speaking ability and must provide these children with

⁵⁵ Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 166.

special language programs which will give them an equal opportunity to obtain an education.

The Federal government's enforcement of Public Law 91.230 and the publication of subsequent regulations on October 14, 1971, clearly states that if payments are to be made to local educational agencies under Title I, parents must be involved in the process of planning, development, operation and evaluation of Title I projects.

The interrelationship of parent, child, teacher and school seems to have implications for attitude development, including the development of support or non-support toward innovative education programs. The literature has provided studies that reflect how parental aspiration affects their children's education. The literature indicated that middle-class parents were ambitious beyond the intellectual capacity of their children. Working-class parents were found to be underambitious and less interested in having their children go on to higher education. Other studies (p. 48) yield similar results. It seems apparent that the higher the level of socioeconomic status of the parents, the higher their expectations are for their children.

There appears to be a need for lower-class and minority community members to be able to identify with the school. They have had minimal and often negative contact with social service agencies; their initial contact with the school is

often overwhelming and difficult. Teachers and school administrators must realize that the family and culture are powerful forces in shaping the child. They must seek ways to develop relationships that involve both the parent and child. Parents must therefore be viewed as collaborators in achieving educational opportunities and support for programs that will benefit their child, not as antagonists to the educational process.

It seems clear that parent attitudes toward bilingual education programs is generally supportive. If the needs of the students are to be met and parent support appears crucial in a bilingual program for success, then it is imperative that bilingual education program administrators understand not only the expectations of the educational institution but also the expectations of the parents and students. Only in this light could such programs be successful.

Chapter Three presents the procedures for the study, including a description of the research design, instruments, sample, data gathering procedures and statistical methodology.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The major purpose of this study was to examine Chinese parents' support for the bilingual education program. This study focused on parents whose children were in bilingual education classes in the elementary grades. It sought to explore the relationship between support and several independent variables: (a) socioeconomic status of the parents, (b) parental involvement with the program, and (c) parent influence in the program.

This chapter describes the methods and procedures used in the study. The procedures used include: (1) the population and sample; (2) the development of the parent questionnaire; (3) method of data collection; and (4) treatment of the data.

The Population and Sample

In this study, the population was from a selected group of Chinese parents who had children in bilingual education programs. The children of the parents attended the Oakland Unified School District, Oakland, California. The sample was 191 Chinese parents who had children attending kindergarten through sixth grades in the bilingual education

program. All comparisons of sample population characteristics with the city are from the Census Area Profile of the City of Oakland.¹

School Sample

Selection of the two California schools surveyed was based on the following criteria:

1. The school district had been involved in Chinese bilingual education for a minimum of four years and had implemented a K-6 bilingual education program.
2. The school district received State or Federal funding for the implementation of a Chinese bilingual education program.
3. The school district had a Chinese bilingual education program office.
4. The school district personnel had indicated a willingness to participate in the study.
5. The two elementary school sites had an Asian student enrollment of 90% and 41%, respectively, in 1982.

Oakland Unified School District met all of the following criteria. The school district has a bilingual

¹ All Oakland Community Data are from the 1980 Census Area Profile, Summary Tape File 3A (St F3A).

education program coupled with a high percentage of Chinese parents. Tables 1, 2 and 3 present the characteristics of the parent sample.

Table 1
Sample Distribution: Frequency of Parent
Responses (in Percentages)
Years Lived in the United States

Years in U.S.	N	%
3 or less	101	52.9*
4 or more	84	43.9
No response	6	3.1
Total	191	100.0

*More than 50% of the parents have lived three years or less in the United States.

The sample population's residence profile of less than three years in the United States as seen in Table 1 indicates a population that is not socially, economically or educationally comparable with the city as a whole. In fact, their attainment level is lower in all three areas. In general, they come from an array of countries in Asia as indicated in Table 2.

Table 2

Sample of Distribution: Frequency of Parent Responses
by Country of Origin (in Percentages)

Country	N	%
China	103	53.9
Hong Kong	12	6.3
Vietnam	56	29.3
All others	10	5.2
No Response	10	5.2
Total	191	100.0

The questionnaire was administered in the Chinese language. An English questionnaire was available and 5% of the parents utilized it.

Schooling

The sample population's educational attainment level as seen in Table 3 tends to be lower than the city's general population. For example, 27% of the city's population completed elementary through less than four years of high school and 57% of the sample population falls within this category. Therefore, this study deals with people who have a lower educational attainment than are typical of Oakland's general population.

Table 3

Sample Distribution: Parental Schooling, Occupation and
Income Levels (in Percentages)
Parental Attainment

Years of Schooling	N	%	Census % ²
Elementary School	68	35.6	27.4*
High School 1 to 3 Years	41	21.5	
High School Graduate	28	14.7	29.4
College 1 to 3 Years	11	5.8	23.8
College Graduate	9	4.7	8.7
No Response	34	17.8	
Total	191	100.0	

Table 3 (continued)

Occupation	N	%	Census % ²
Professional or Licensed Practitioner	5	2.6	-**
Manager or Owner of Business	7	3.7	-
Technician (mechanic, electrician)	12	6.3	-
Skilled Worker (seamstress)	28	14.7	-
Personal Services (waiter, cook)	34	17.8	-
Unskilled Worker or Laborer (custodian)	40	20.9	-
Housewife	25	13.1	-
No Response	40	20.9	-
Total	191	100.0	

Table 3 (continued)

Income		N	%	1980 Census		N	Census %
Under	\$9,999	89	46.6	Under	\$9,999	22844	23.8
\$10,000 - \$14,999		52	27.2	\$10,000 - \$19,999		22091	27.4
\$15,000 - \$24,999		24	12.6	\$20,000 - \$29,999		17100	21.2
\$25,000 - \$34,999		6	3.1	\$30,000 - \$39,999		9261	11.4
\$35,000 - \$44,999		0	0	\$40,000 - \$49,999		4508	05.5
\$45,000 or more		1	0.5	\$50,000 - \$59,999		3521	04.3
No Response		19	9.9	\$75,000 and up		1289	01.5
Total		191	100.0				

² 1980 Census Area Profile, Asian/Pacific Islanders.

* Census data combines elementary through less than four years of high school.

** No data were compiled.

Family Income Profile

The sample population's income levels depicted in Table 3 are somewhat lower than the city as a whole. For example, 46% of the sample have income below \$9,999, while the city's (Oakland) population indicates only 28.3% below \$9,999.

Socioeconomic Status

For the purpose of this study socioeconomic status was defined as a composite variable comprising education, occupation and income. As indicated above, this study deals with people that have a lower socioeconomic status than are typical in Oakland.

The Development of the Instrument

The questionnaire was developed through a review of the literature and a subsequent revision of other bilingual education questionnaires pertinent to this study. In order to gather additional information pertaining to the needs and concerns of bilingual education, educators from the University of the Pacific and the Oakland Unified School District were interviewed. The resultant questionnaire was submitted to various faculty and practitioners for modifications, relevance and applicability.

The parent questionnaire was field tested in Commodore Stockton Elementary School in San Francisco, California. The test population was very similar to the group of Chinese

parents that were studied in Oakland, California. The questionnaire was printed in English and Chinese. It was first submitted to the San Francisco Unified School District Office of Special Funded Projects on September 21, 1983. The parent questionnaire was accepted and permission was granted to proceed with the field test, providing the cooperation of the site principal could be obtained.

The elementary school principal was contacted on October 4, 1983, and a meeting occurred on October 13, 1983. Permission was granted with two stipulations. The first stipulation was that a phrase be included in the parent letter, "Your help in this matter is voluntary and your answers will be confidential." The second stipulation was to enlist the cooperation of the teachers and that their cooperation be voluntary. A meeting with the two teachers established a commitment of cooperation. The parent questionnaires, printed in English and Chinese, were distributed to parents by students in grades one and three on October 18, 1983 and returned on October 21, 1983. A total of 43 parent questionnaires were obtained from a sample of 72 which were sent home. The return rate was computed to be 59%.

The field tested questionnaires and results were returned to the researcher for analysis. The analysis required that a few additions be made to the questionnaire

including additional space in which the respondents could place an appropriate check mark.

The parent questionnaire was submitted to the Oakland Unified District Research Department on October 3, 1983. The parent questionnaire was accepted and permission was granted to proceed with the dissemination of the questionnaire. A meeting with the two site principals and ten Chinese bilingual classroom teachers was held on November 11, 1983, and a commitment of cooperation was obtained. The parent questionnaires, printed in English and Chinese, were given to students to deliver to their parents on November 14, 1983, and returned by the students to their teachers on November 18, 1983. A total of 191 parent questionnaires were obtained from a sample of 250 which were sent home. The return rate was computed to be 76.4%.

The questionnaire may be found in Appendix A. The items were rated on a one to four point Likert type scale designed to indicate the response of the parents in terms of socioeconomic status, parental involvement and parent influence as they relate to parental support of the bilingual evaluation program.

Questionnaire Content

The questionnaire was divided into four sections designed to provide information on the following areas:

- (1) socioeconomic status; (2) parental involvement; (3) parent influence; and (4) parent support.

The section of the questionnaire concerning the socioeconomic status of the parents was designed to ascertain the representativeness of parents by collecting biographical data such as: (1) age; (2) sex; (3) place of birth; (4) years of residence in the United States; (5) education; and (6) occupation.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of three subsections designed to provide information on the following areas: (1) parental involvement (participation, knowledge); (2) parent influence; and (3) parent support. Each area contained items which appeared to the investigator to be important in providing feedback for administering bilingual education programs.

The Rating Scale Used

To facilitate statistical analysis, the method of summated rating, generally associated with the work of Likert, was employed. Each item required checking one of several possible alternatives. Items pertaining to demographic variables such as education, occupation and income had five to seven alternatives, while items pertaining to parental involvement, parent influence in the

program and parent support listed two to four alternatives. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

The alternatives that were coded 1 represented the least degree of parental involvement, influence or support. The higher coded numerical alternatives reflected a greater degree of parental involvement, influence or support.

Methods of Data Collection

To facilitate the return of a high percentage of questionnaires, the distribution was completed in the following manner:

1. The questionnaire was distributed by the classroom teacher, which included a cover letter to the teacher and parents.
2. A deadline date of four days was established in an effort to receive as many questionnaires as possible.
3. One of the methods used was to follow up the questionnaire with some discussion among a sub-sample of parents.

The percentage of returned responses of the parents was 76%. The data obtained through the questionnaires were processed and analyzed at the University of the Pacific Computer Center.

Treatment of the Data

Hypotheses one through three were tested through the use of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Hypothesis One: There is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent socioeconomic status. Hypothesis Two: There is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent involvement (participation and knowledge). Hypothesis Three: There is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent influence in the program. Further testing of the hypotheses was accomplished through the use of a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), which determined whether or not a significant mean difference in each category existed. The level of significance for all hypotheses was set at 0.05. This was done to determine whether there is a significant difference between two or more means with a confidence level of ninety-five percent.³

Summary

Chapter 3 presents the research procedures utilized in the study. The procedures include: (1) sample selection

³ L. R. Gay, Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976), p. 254.

and comparison with the city of Oakland; (2) the development of the questionnaire; (3) the selection of the population; (4) the gathering of data; and (5) the treatment of the data. Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the data and interpretation of the results.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study was designed to examine the support of Chinese parents for a bilingual education program. Three null hypotheses were developed to explore the relationship between support and three variables: (a) socioeconomic status of the parents, (b) parental involvement, and (c) parent influence in the bilingual education program.

This chapter presents the findings of the study. Each null hypothesis is restated, and the results of the data analysis are presented in descriptive and tabular form. The hypotheses are either rejected or retained, with additional analysis and discussion as appropriate.

The hypotheses were tested through the use of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. The following were tested: (a) the relationship between parent support scores and socioeconomic status scores; (b) the relationship between parent support scores and parent involvement scores; and (c) the relationship between parent support scores and parent influence scores.

Further testing of hypotheses one through three was accomplished through the use of a one-way Analysis of

Variance (ANOVA), which determined whether significant differences in each category existed. The level of significance for all hypotheses was set at 0.05. Following are the baseline data as revealed by the questionnaire which was administered to the parents. Presented are frequency distribution tables concerning level of parent socioeconomic status, level of parent support, level of parent influence and level of parent influence and level of parent involvement.

Table 4
Level of Parents' Socioeconomic Status

Weighted Code	N	%
3	8	4.2
4	16	8.4
5	14	7.3
6	22	11.5
7	20	10.5
8	18	9.4
9	10	5.2
10	7	3.7
12	1	0.5
13	2	1.0
14	5	2.6
18	1	0.5
0	67	35.1
Total	191	100.0

Socioeconomic Status (SES) was a composite variable measured by questions 5, 6, and 8 pertaining to education, occupation and income. SES scores could range from 3 to 18 points with the larger values reflecting higher SES. The respondents were categorized into two groups based on SES scores; 3 through 6 comprised the lower level and 7 through 18 comprised the higher level.

Table 5
Level of Parent Support for Bilingual Education

Weighted Code	N	%
7	0	0.0
8	1	0.5
10	1	0.5
13	1	0.5
14	7	3.7
15	7	3.7
16	7	3.7
17	2	1.0
18	7	3.7
19	5	2.6
20	14	7.3
21	14	7.3
22	17	8.9
23	7	3.7
24	11	5.8
25	12	6.3
26	13	6.8
27	13	6.8
28	31	16.2
0	21	11.0
Total	191	100.0

A measure of parent support was based on seven questionnaire items 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27. Therefore, a minimum of parent support was 7 and a maximum was 28 points. It would appear from Table 6 that there is substantial support for the bilingual education program among this parent group.

Table 6
Level of Parent Influence Upon the Bilingual
Education Program

Total Score	N	%
2	0	0.0
3	24	12.6
4	91	47.6
5	49	25.7
No Response	21	14.1
Total	191	100.0

Parent influence scores were based on questionnaire items 21 and 22. A score yielding a minimum parent influence score of 2 and a maximum parent influence score of 8. The table reveals the majority of parents (47.6%) responded that they exerted a slight to moderate amount of influence.

Table 7
 Level of Parental Involvement (Participation,
 Knowledge) with the Bilingual
 Education Program

Total Score	N	%
10	1	0.5
11	5	2.6
12	16	8.4
13	14	7.3
14	31	16.2
15	12	6.3
16	13	6.8
17	9	4.7
18	6	3.1
19	1	0.5
20	2	1.0
21	1	0.5
23	1	0.5
25	1	0.5
26	0	0.0
0	78	40.8
Total	191	100.0

Parent involvement scores were based on questionnaire items 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18. The

minimum score would be 10 and the maximum score would be 26. It appears from Table 8 that the majority of the parents report a low level of involvement with the bilingual education program.

Testing of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

There is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent socioeconomic status.

Findings. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient between SES and support of the bilingual program for this hypothesis was $r = -.10$, with a probability of $p = .14$, which is above the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, there is no statistical correlation between parent support and socioeconomic status. A further analysis of the relationship between income and parents' support indicated that income was slightly negatively related to parent support when analyzed separately with $r = -.20$ and $p = .005$.

Table 9 presents a correlation matrix which includes the variables Parent Support, Education, Occupation, Income, and the composite variable Socioeconomic Status.

Although statistically significant the relation between SES and parent support is very slight and practically negligible. The researcher conducted an informal follow-up discussion with a small sample of parents that seem to

Table 8

Pearson Correlation Matrix for Variables Parent Support (PS),
Education (EDUC), Occupation (OCCU),
Income and Socioeconomic Status (SES)

	PS ^a	EDUC ^a	OCCU ^a	Income ^a	SES ^a
PS		$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{-0.07}{0.21}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.09}{0.15}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{-0.20}{0.005*}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{-0.10}{0.14}$
EDUC	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{-0.07}{0.21}$	--	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.31}{0.00}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.41}{0.00}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.75}{0.00}$
OCCU	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.09}{0.15}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.31}{0.00}$	--	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.34}{0.00}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.80}{0.00}$
Income	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.20}{0.005*}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.41}{0.00}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.34}{0.00}$	--	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.69}{0.00}$
SES	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{-0.10}{0.14}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.75}{0.00}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.80}{0.00}$	$\frac{r}{p} = \frac{0.69}{0.00}$	--

* $p < 0.05$

^a Sample size varied from N = 115 to N = 159 for these coefficients.

indicate a desire on the part of parents to hold on to the "old" ways, while they became involved in the new one. They stated that one of the reasons for support of bilingual education was to make this controlled transition into American culture. The low SES parents felt a stronger need to maintain their cultural ties while they learned how to become involved with the American social structure.

The above findings related to the support of bilingual education programs by lower socioeconomic parents, is reflected in previous research done on Mexican-Americans by Gutierrez, who indicated that those in the lower socioeconomic groups were more supportive of bilingual education programs than those in the upper socioeconomic groups.¹ The other SES factors do not significantly relate to parent support. Thus, Hypothesis One is retained.

Hypothesis Two

There is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parental involvement (participation and knowledge).

Findings. Table 9 reveals that parent involvement is statistically significant in terms of parent support in a positive direction. This suggests that there is a slight

¹ Gutierrez, op. cit., p. 144.

finding for involvement scores to be associated with stronger parent support scores. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient $\underline{r} = -.26$ for this test resulted in a probability level of $\underline{p} = 0.006$, which is within the region of statistical significance but practically insignificant. A very slight positive correlation therefore exists between parent support and parent involvement.

Table 9
Pearson Correlation Matrix for Variables
Parental Involvement, Parent Influence
and Parent Support

	Parental Involvement	Parent Influence	Parent Support
Parental Involvement		$\underline{r} = 0.02$ $\underline{p} = 0.86$	$\underline{r} = 0.26$ $\underline{p} = 0.006^*$
Parent Influence	$\underline{r} = 0.02$ $\underline{p} = 0.86$		$\underline{r} = 0.07$ $\underline{p} = 0.41$
Parent Support	$\underline{r} = 0.26$ $\underline{p} = 0.006$	$\underline{r} = 0.07$ $\underline{p} = 0.41$	

* $\underline{p} < 0.05$

To gain further clarification regarding the data parental support scores were divided into a lower level and a higher level. These scores were used as a factor in a one-way ANOVA with parental involvement as the dependent variable and resulted in a F value of $F = 8.6$ with a probability level of $p = .004$, which is statistically significant. The higher parent support group had a greater involvement mean than the lower parent support group. Table 10 provides the details of the analysis and states the involvement mean obtained for each group.

Table 10
Analysis of Variance of Parents' Involvement/
Parent Support

Source	<u>df</u>	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between Support Levels	1	48.96	48.96	8.60	0.0041*
Within Support Levels	106	652.63	5.70		
Group Identification			Involvement Means		
Lower Parent Support Group			13.96		
Higher Parent Support Group			15.30		

* $p < 0.05$

Based upon the results of this analysis, Hypothesis Two is rejected.

Hypothesis Three

There is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent influence in the program.

Findings. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient for this hypothesis resulted in a $r = 0.02$ with a probability level of 0.41, which is well above the 0.05 alpha level. This means that no statistically significant relationship was found between parent support and parent influence. Table 10 provides the details of the analysis. Based upon the results of this analysis, Hypothesis Three is retained.

Summary

Chapter four has presented the findings of the study including the analyses of the data. Hypothesis one was retained: there is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent socioeconomic status. Hypothesis two was rejected: there is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent involvement (participation and knowledge). Hypothesis three was retained: there is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent influence.

Chapter five presents the conclusion, discussion, and recommendations which are indicated from the data of the study.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The issue of equal opportunities has raised questions in our schools, causing many changes in the way equal opportunity programs are administered. This study examined one facet of equal opportunity and dealt with one ethnic group, specifically the Chinese. In a general way, the study examined parent involvement in public schools having bilingual education programs.

This study was designed to examine Chinese parents' support for the bilingual education program. Three null hypotheses were developed to explore the relationship between school support and three dependent variables: (a) socioeconomic status of the parents, (b) parent involvement, and (c) parent influence in the program.

The historical experience of the Chinese in America discloses over a century of racial/ethnic discrimination. Some studies conclude that racism against the Chinese was developed and fostered by the Christian missionaries prior to 1850, when various negative stereotypes were established. There were two distinct cultural reactions to the American experience.

One group called sojourners, wanted to return to China, but became scapegoats for the economic ills of the United States in the 1850's. Some racist practices and legislation directed against these Chinese are still present today. Today's Chinatowns afford these Chinese the chance to live their daily lives totally within a Chinese environment. The Chinatowns provide sanctuary for today's sojourners and new immigrants.

The other group chose to identify with the Anglo culture and became Chinese-Americans. They and their children have frequently been assimilated and speak only English. Some have developed bilingual abilities and are able to function both in Chinatown and English-speaking environments.

The sample population in this study was basically immigrant and faced the same choice as the Chinese in the 1850's. They have had some of the experiences of the old immigrants and are looking for means to preserve some of the "old" ways while they learn how to cope with their new environment. Their approach seems to be directed toward making a regulated, controlled transition into American life. In other words, their choice is to become Chinese-Americans rather than sojourners.

The sample population included a larger percentage of lower SES parents than is found in the general population. The sample was below the poverty level economically and

fifty percent have been in the United States less than three years. The majority of people in the study have not been integrated nor assimilated into the mainstream American social structure, so the study provides an opportunity to see the degree of support new immigrants have for a bilingual education program. The nature of this population should be kept in mind as the data from the study are examined.

Hypothesis One stated that there is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual program and parent socioeconomic status. Socioeconomic status was a composite variable which included education, and income categories. The data indicated no significant statistical difference between parent support and socioeconomic status (SES). Support for bilingual education programs was similar between high and low socioeconomic status parents.

A further analysis of income, one of the component factors of SES, indicated that it was negatively related to parental support. That is, as family income rises, parental support lessens. Rising income seems to be a possible indicator of integration into American social structure. Support for bilingual education seems to drop off as assimilation or integration into the American social structure occurs, so that there seems to be a distinctive role for bilingual education when dealing with immigrant

populations. This finding is supported by Gutierrez's study, which found that the lower socioeconomic groups were more supportive of bilingual education programs.¹

The follow up information interview data from the study indicated the desire for low income parents to be introduced into American culture in a regulated, moderated way. They wanted to reaffirm their basic values and language in addition to learning how to use and deal with the American social structure.

Some Chinese parents apparently feel less need to support bilingual education because they already understand how they are going to survive in the American social structure. Those who are outside the American social structure seem to need the support and the help that bilingual education programs can offer their children.

Some of the parents expressed the fear of being cast aside and losing the respect and control of their children. With the support of a bilingual program, parents can establish the validity of their home culture as their children learn American culture. In this light, bilingual education may be a way to help children and parents remain

¹ Lorraine P. Gutierrez, "Attitudes Toward Bilingual Education: A Study of Parents with Children in Selected Bilingual Programs," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1972), p. 144.

close as the children make the inevitable choice to learn how to survive in American culture. This is one potential way to anchor their cultural roots with their parents while they learn how to survive.

Bilingual education in its most positive sense can be seen as the legitimate of both old and new ways. In other words, bilingual education legitimates the parents and the old culture while it legitimates America, the new culture. It helps parents retain prestige and influence with their children as well as their self respect. It does this as the children learn how to operate in the American social structure. This finding is supported by Lightfoot, who notes that fears of parents grow as they lose control of their child's daily life, as someone else becomes the expert and judge of their child, and as the parents are perceived as intruders by teachers and school administrators.²

Hypothesis Two stated that there is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual education program and parent involvement (participation and knowledge). The findings revealed that parent involvement is slightly correlated with parent support in a mildly positive manner. This means that to a negligible degree, the more active

² Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, World Apart: Relationships Between Families and Schools (New York: Basic Books Inc., Publishers, 1978), p. 38.

and more knowledgeable a parent is in relation to the bilingual program, the more supportive he or she tends to be of the program. This finding is supported by Adorno's study, which found that the more knowledgeable and informed the parents, the more supportive they are toward the bilingual education program.³

Parent involvement seems to be associated with parent support. Initial reasons for involvement may be fears about what could happen to their children if they lack knowledge of American culture. Parents could have fears about living in a new country which include contact with other ethnic groups. Parent involvement dissipates over a period of time. One of the reasons appears to be that as parents get higher paying jobs and become more established in the social structure, their involvement in the bilingual program appears to diminish.

A further note is that parents who expressed a lower degree of knowledge and participation in the program were still moderately supportive. This study did not find one respondent who viewed bilingual education in a negative manner.

³ William D. Adorno, "The Attitudes of Selected Mexican and Mexican-American Parents in Regards to Bilingual/Bicultural Education," (Ph.D. Dissertation, United States International University, 1973), p. 186.

Hypothesis Three stated that there is no relationship between level of support for the bilingual education program and parent influence in the program. The findings reveal that parent influence is not correlated with parent support. This means that the group of parents in this study expressed support for the program, even though their influence or input was felt to be negated by the teachers or school administrators. This may be explained by the cultural differences experienced by the parent group studied.

The educational process in their native countries of China, Taiwan, or Vietnam does not encourage lay involvement in the schools. Parents are neither asked nor encouraged to participate in the schools. With this prevailing attitude of non-involvement and non-influence in educational decision making, it is not surprising that this group of low income undereducated parents would let the teachers and school administrators determine what is best for their children and be supportive of their decisions.

Overall, this sample group of low income, limited English speaking immigrant Chinese parents was supportive of the bilingual education program. From this study it can be concluded that low socioeconomic immigrant Chinese parents constitute a strong base of support for the bilingual education program in the Oakland Unified School District.

In summary, the theoretical constructs set forth by Affirmative Action programs and the "War on Poverty" in the

1960's seem to be confirmed by this study. Parent involvement generated support for the school. Bilingual education proved to be a healthy supportive program for this sample of parents. In addition, there is a body of positive literature on parent involvement in the schools which supports the findings of this study.

The study population, though basically low income and generally non-English speaking, was supportive of bilingual education even though the support waned with upward mobility. Bilingual education still seems to provide a genuine and valid function in helping regulate the entrance of this population into the American social structure. This is what bilingual education was designed to do and when allowed to operate, it seems to perform this function very well.

Discussion and Recommendations for Further Research

One point that emerged from this study is that there seems to be more conceptual confusion regarding the types of bilingual education programs that parents want. Parents in this study want to make a transition at an acceptable rate into the American social system and don't necessarily want the school to maintain their culture indefinitely, which is what critics of bilingual education charge. They also do not want a program which tries to teach the language

overnight and which compounds the confusion and fears that new immigrants have about the new and unknown life in the United States.

Therefore, what has to be considered before future research is done on bilingual education is that conceptual confusion surrounding the labels of maintenance and transitional programs be clarified. Both bilingual education approaches are designed to make transitions, so it is a misnomer to call one a maintenance program and the other a transitional program.

Both types of programs make a transition. One is rapid, a forced transition (Transitional Bilingualism) in which children are immersed in a new language and a new culture. The other (Biliterate Bilingualism or Maintenance) is a controlled or regulated transition in which children are anchored in their own culture, while they are introduced to the new culture.

From the fears of parents, it seems obvious that there is no attempt to preserve anyone's culture at public expense. Parents do not want to preserve their culture as a form of social welfare; rather, what they want is to make a controlled transition into American culture that does not cut them off from their roots and children. One type of bilingual program (Transitional Bilingualism) cuts people off and does not recognize their culture as a factor in

learning. This stigmatizes them as having either no culture or a devalued subordinate culture. The Biliterate Bilingual or Maintenance type program helps the family to remain intact as it makes the transition into American culture. If parents are disregarded by their youth, the family as a unit disintegrates. This disruption of family structure generally leads to a whole range of social problems.

Presently, there is widespread misunderstanding of these two terms. The term maintenance has caused needless confusion because the assumption has been made that maintenance means that people will never learn English. It has proved confusing and costly in terms of public and political support for bilingual education. The field of bilingual education needs to overcome this confusion by clarifying the full range of distinction between these program types and specify how each works. Research needs to be done related to clarifying a definition of bilingual education as well as the kind of program parents and educators will generally support.

A second needed area of research is to learn why or if parents from different ethnic groups want bilingual education. Some of the parents may want to maintain the "old" ways which may be difficult, but others may wish for a moderate transition into the American social system. This study has concluded that the moderate approach is desired by

Chinese immigrants and the history of minority groups in this country contains enough evidence to show that a rapid transition results in substantial social subordination which takes generations to overcome. From these data, it seems that bilingual education helps people make an adjustment to American culture in a healthier, more positive way. This is a relatively unexplored area in bilingual educational research. It is recommended that more research be done to find out how bilingual education functions in the lives of non-English speaking immigrants in addition to Chinese immigrants.

A third area for research could be a comparison of recent immigrant groups to see if there is a trend for immigrant families to become less supportive of bilingual education programs as they become more economically successful.

A final suggestion for further research would be that this study be replicated with not only a larger population, but a more diverse one economically. It is suggested that in addition an interview methodology be used which might yield a greater understanding of these issues.

In conclusion, this study suggests that parent involvement is associated with parent support in a positive manner. The salient point is that Chinese bilingual educators would be wise to actively promote the involvement of Chinese

parents with the educational program in order to ensure parental support. Therefore, it is with this specific population in mind that the following parental involvement procedures are recommended.

- a. Inservice meetings for school personnel to aid in the understanding and active participation in the parental involvement program of Chinese parents.
- b. Chinese bilingual community aides should be on the staff to make home telephone calls and visitations.
- c. Specific procedures established in the school should be in effect to make parents feel comfortable and welcome at all school related meetings.
- d. An informal communication network should be established in order to personalize parental involvement.
- e. A more formal bilingual newsletter should be edited and distributed to parents.
- f. Meetings should be organized so that they center on topics of concern and interest of the parents.
- g. The school sites should make child care facilities available when parent meetings are held.

- h. Parents meetings should be held when working parents are able to attend.

The above list of recommendations were the result of informal interviews with Chinese bilingual school site personnel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bailey, Stephen and E. K. Moshen. ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law. Syracuse: Syracuse University.
- Fishman, Joshua A. Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1976.
- Gay, L. R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976.
- Kloss, Hein. The American Bilingual Tradition. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1977.
- Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence. Worlds Apart: Relationships Between Families and Schools. New York: Basic Books, 1978.
- Nee, Victor G. and Bret de Bary. Longtime Californ': A Documentary Study of an American Chinatown. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- Rein, Martin and S. M. Miller. Citizen Participation and Poverty: Educating the Disadvantaged, School Year 1968-69. New York: A. M. S. Press, 1970.
- Ripley, LaVern. The German-Americans. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1976.
- Sandmeyer, Elmer C. The Anti-Chinese Movement in California. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
- Sung, Betty Lee. The Story of the Chinese in America. New York: Collier Books, 1971.
- Valencia, Atilaho. Implementing Bilingual/Bicultural Education. Berkeley: Bay Area Bilingual Education League, 1976.

Journals

- Anon. "Battle over Bilingualism," Time (September, 1980).
- Cronin, Joseph M. "Parents and Educators: Natural Allies," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIX (1977).
- Gallup, George H. "The 12th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LXII (1980).
- Gonzalez, J. M. "Coming of Age in Bilingual/Bicultural Education a Historical Perspective," Inequality in Education, No. 19 (1975).
- Pallister, R. and J. Wilson. "Parents' Attitudes to Education," National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, Vol. 13 (1970).
- Pulte, William. "Are Bilingual/Bicultural Programs Socially Diverse," The Educational Digest (May, 1979).
- Roper, Dwight. "Parents as the Natural Enemy of the School System," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIX (1977).
- Schardt, Arlie, et al. "A Battle in Any Language," Newsweek (December 15, 1980).
- The New York Times, (May 16, 1975).
- Thernstrom, Abigail M. "Bilingual Mis-education," New Republic (April 18, 1981).
- Thomas, William B. "Parental and Community Involvement: Rx for Better School Discipline," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LXII (1980).
- Valverde, Leonard A. and Frank Brown. "Equal Educational Opportunity and Bilingual/Bicultural Education: A Socioeconomic Perspective," Education and Urban Society, Vol. X (May, 1978).
- Wolf, Elinor K. "The Case for Parental Involvement," Parents Magazine, XLIV (1969).

Unpublished Dissertations

- Gutierrez, Lorraine P. "Attitudes Toward Bilingual Education A Study of Parents with Children in Selected Bilingual Programs." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1972.
- Nava, Paul. "Bilingual/Bicultural Program Coordinator Role and Role Effectiveness." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1979.

Government Documents

- 1980 Census Area Profile, Summary Tape File 3A(ST F3A).
- Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, ESEA). Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees, Washington, D.C., 1971.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. Hispanic Student Achievement in Five Learning Areas: 1971-1975. National Assessment of Educational Progress is funded by and under contract with the National Center for Educational Statistics, May 1977.
- Ramirez III, Manuel, et al. Spanish-English Bilingual Education in the United States: Current Issues, Resources and Recommended Funding, Systems and Evaluations in Education, National Institute of Education, 1975.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Parental Involvement in Title I ESEA, Washington, D.C., 1972.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Second Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, Washington, D.C., 1976.

Other Sources

Benjamin, Harold. The Schools and National Security.
New York: McGraw Hill, 1951.

Coons, John E. and Stephen D. Sugarman. Education by
Choice. Berkeley: University of California, 1978.

Lau v. Nichols, 414, U.S., 563 (1974).

Oakland Unified School District Office of Bilingual
Education Comprehensive Education Plan for Services/
Programs, September, 1981.

Facts, Oakland Unified School District, Office
Publications/Public Information, 1981.

APPENDIX

Dear Parents:

I am a graduate student at the University of the Pacific, Stockton. As part of my doctoral studies, it is very important that you complete this questionnaire. I have personally selected you to assist in this study. Your help in this matter is voluntary and your answers will be confidential. The questionnaire will be used to study parent's support for Bilingual Educational programs. As you well know the attitudes and support of parents are very important to the success of school programs. The study results will be available to the public upon request. Please answer each question. Thank you for your participation in this endeavor.

Respectfully,

Edmond Lee

Please return to the teacher by November 18, 1983.

請於十一月十八日前將此項問卷調查交還給老師。

親愛的家長：

我是士德頓市太平洋大學 (UNIVERSITY OF PACIFIC, STOCKTON) 的研究生。這些問卷調查是完成我博士學位的重要課程之一。我誠懇地希望您回答下列的問卷調查。您被選為協助問卷調查的對象之一。您的協助是志願的。您的答案將會保密。這份問卷調查將用來做學生家長支持雙語教學的研究。您已知道，學生家長熱心的態度與支持是學校課程成功的重要因素。問卷調查研究的結果將會公開給大眾。請回答每一個問題。謝謝您的合作。

李悅文

Dear Parents:

Please answer every question.

1. My age is._____.
2. My sex is female_____ male_____.
3. I was born in_____.
4. I have lived in the United States since_____.
5. What level of schooling has the head of the household attained?

Elementary_____ 1 to 3 years of High School_____

High School Graduate_____ 1 to 3 years of College_____

College Graduate_____

6. What is the head of the household's occupation?
- _____ professional or licensed Practitioner (like
doctor, lawyer, etc.)
- _____ manager or owner of business establishment
- _____ technical (like mechanic, T.V., repairman,
electrician, etc.)
- _____ skilled worker (like seamstress, tailor, etc.)
- _____ personal services (like waiter, cook, bartender,
storekeeper, etc.)
- _____ unskilled worker or laborer (like kitchen helper,
custodian, etc.)
- _____ housewife

7. Which parents do you feel is more supportive of the Bilingual Program?
Father_____ Mother_____ Both equally supportive_____
8. Annual family income: Under \$9,999_____
\$10,000-\$14,999_____ \$15,000-\$24,999_____
\$25,000-\$34,999_____ \$35,000-\$44,999_____
\$45,000 or more_____
9. I have assisted in 0____ 1-3____ 4+ ____ field trips during the school year.
10. I have served as a classroom volunteer 0____ 1-3____ 4+ ____ days during the school year.
11. I have attended 0____ 1-3____ 4+ ____ meetings of the School Bilingual Advisory Committee during the school year.
12. I have attended 0____ 1-3____ 4+ ____ parent-teacher conferences.
13. I have attended 0____ 1-3____ 4+ ____ District Advisory Bilingual Parent meetings.
14. I have attended 0____ 1-3____ 4+ ____ out of town Bilingual conferences.
15. I understand the goals of the Bilingual Program.
Yes_____ No_____
16. There are presently _____ Bilingual teachers at our school.
Yes_____ No_____ I don't know_____

17. I understand the role of parents in the Bilingual Program.

Yes _____ No _____

18. I feel that I have enough information about the Bilingual Program.

Yes _____ No _____

19. How satisfied are you with the teachers responses toward parent suggestions?

Very satisfied _____ Satisfied _____ Not Satisfied _____

20. The influence of parents on the Bilingual Program is:

Too much _____ The Right Amount _____ Too Little _____

21. I feel my child(ren) works harder in school because of the Bilingual Program.

Never _____ Sometimes _____ Often _____ Always _____

22. I feel my child(ren) likes school better because of the Bilingual Program.

Never _____ Sometimes _____ Often _____ Always _____

23. I feel that the Bilingual Program will help my child(ren) learn English faster.

Never _____ Sometimes _____ Often _____ Always _____

24. I feel that the Bilingual Program is good for the school.

Never _____ Sometimes _____ Often _____ Always _____

25. I feel my child(ren) learns more because of the Bilingual Program.

Never_____ Sometimes_____ Often_____ Always_____

26. I feel the Bilingual Program helps child(ren) socially.

Never_____ Sometimes_____ Often_____ Always_____

27. I feel my child(ren) participates more in school activities because of the Bilingual Program.

Never_____ Sometimes_____ Often_____ Always_____

親愛的家長：

請回答每一個問題。

1. 我今年_____歲。

2. 我的性別是 女_____ 男_____。

3. 我在_____出生。

4. 我從_____年起便在美國居住和生活。

5. 您家中一家之主曾入學校讀多少年書？

小學_____，一至三年高中_____，高中畢業_____，
一至三年大學_____，大學畢業_____。

6. 您家中一家之主的職業是什麼？

_____ 專業人士（如醫生，律師等）

_____ 經理或老闆

_____ 技師（如技工，電視修理員，电工等）

_____ 技術工人（如車衣工人，裁縫等）

_____ 服務性質工人（如企指，廚司，酒保，店員等）

_____ 非技術工人或勞工（如廚房助手，清潔工等）

_____ 家庭主婦

7. 在您家中，那位較支持雙語教育？

父親_____ 母親_____ 父母一樣支持_____。

8. 您全家一年總收入是:

9,999元以下 _____ 10,000 至 14,999 元 _____
 15,000 元至 24,999 元 _____ 25,000 至 34,999 元 _____
 35,000 元至 44,999 元 _____ 45,000 元或以上 _____

9. 我曾協助學校的實地考察旅行 (Field Trip):

無 (0) _____ 1-3 次 _____ 4 次以上 _____

10. 我曾任課室義務員:

無 (0) _____ 1-3 天 _____ 4 天以上 _____

11. 我曾參加學校雙語諮詢委員會集會:

無 (0) _____ 1-3 次 _____ 4 次以上 _____

12. 我曾參加教師家長座談會:

無 (0) _____ 1-3 次 _____ 4 次以上 _____

13. 我曾參加校區雙語家長諮詢會:

無 (0) _____ 1-3 次 _____ 4 次以上 _____

14. 我曾參加在別個城市舉行的雙語討論會:

無 (0) _____ 1-3 次 _____ 4 次以上 _____

15. 我明白雙語教育的目標. 是 _____ 否 _____

16. 在我的學校中現有雙語教師 _____ 個.

有 _____ 沒有 _____ 不知道 _____

17. 我明白家長在雙語教育中所擔任的角色是什麼。
是 _____ 否 _____
18. 我覺得我有足夠有關雙語教育的資料。
有 _____ 沒有 _____
19. 您覺得老師對家長所提意見的反應如何？
很滿意 _____ 滿意 _____ 不滿意 _____
20. 家長們對雙語教育的影響是：
太多 _____ 適中 _____ 太少 _____
21. 我覺得我的兒女因接受雙語教育而比較用功。
沒有 _____ 有時 _____ 經常 _____ 總是 _____
22. 我覺得我的兒女因為雙語教育而比較喜歡上學。
沒有 _____ 有時 _____ 經常 _____ 總是 _____
23. 我覺得雙語教育會增進我的兒女學習英文的速度。
沒有 _____ 有時 _____ 經常 _____ 總是 _____
24. 我覺得雙語教育對學校是好的。
沒有 _____ 有時 _____ 經常 _____ 總是 _____
25. 我覺得雙語教育使我的兒女學習更多。
沒有 _____ 有時 _____ 經常 _____ 總是 _____

26. 我覺得雙語教育對學生在社交上有幫助。

沒有_____ 有時_____ 經常_____ 總是_____

27. 我覺得因雙語教育而使我的兒女參加更多學校活動。

沒有_____ 有時_____ 經常_____ 總是_____